

REMARKS

Claims 1-82 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In an Office action dated May 22, 2006, claims 1-82 were rejected. Applicants thank Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and addresses Examiner's comments below.

Claims 1, 8, 15, 17-19, 21, 24-27, 35, 37, 39, 41, 46, 48-50, 52, 57, 59-61, 63, and 71 are amended herein. No claims are cancelled or added. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seek to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 112

In the 3rd paragraph of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 1-20 under 35 USC § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have amended claim 1 by replacing “the identified structured datum” by “the structured datum.” Claim 1 as amended recites “a handler component configured to retrieve a source data file including at least one structured datum,” providing antecedent basis for the structured datum. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-20 as amended now obviate the basis for the rejection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

This amendment has been made to improve readability of the claims, and does not narrow the scope of protection with respect to the prior art, or with respect to potentially infringing devices/compositions/articles.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b) in View of Walker

In the 4th paragraph of the Office action, Examiner rejects claims 1-15, 19-38, 41-49, 52-60, 62-77, and 79-82 under 35 USC § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by EPO Publication No. WO 01/86390 by Walker et al. (“Walker”). Claims 1, 8, 15, 19, 21, 24-27, 35, 37, 41, 46, 48, 49, 52, 57, 59, 60, 63, and 71 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-15, 19-38, 41-49, 52-60, 62-77, and 79-82 as amended are patentable over the cited reference, and in condition for allowance.

Representative claim 21 as amended specifically recites, *inter alia*, the following:

responsive to a pointer being over the structured datum, transmitting additional information from the reference database according to the association, the additional information being simultaneously displayable as an overlay in an area proximate to the structured datum.

Support for the amendment can be found in the specification as filed, for example, from page 7, line 11 to line 17, and Figure 7. For example, the specification discloses that when a viewer moves a pointer over a structured datum in an augmented data file, additional information associated with the structured datum is transmitted from the reference database and displayed in a new layer, e.g., an overlay, near the structured datum. Claim 21 recites transmitting additional information *when* a viewer of the augmented data file moves the pointer over the structured datum, so that the additional information can be displayed near the structured datum as an overlay on the augmented data file. This claimed feature is advantageous because the viewer only needs to *move* the pointer over the structured datum to

view the additional information rather than having to “click” a hyperlink. Furthermore, the additional information being displayed to the viewer is transmitted from the reference database ***when*** the pointer moves over the structured datum. Therefore, the additional information displayed to the viewer is the most up-to-date information in the reference database associated with the structured datum as of the moment when the viewer moves the pointer over the structured datum. Likewise, claims 1, 30, 41, 52, and 63 recite the above feature of transmitting additional information to be displayed when the pointer moves over the structured datum.

Walker, among other differences, does not disclose transmitting additional information from a separate database to be displayed when the pointer moves over the structured datum. Rather, Walker discloses a method to incorporate hyperlinks into electronic files from a preference database based on the content of the files, and present viewers with the files along with the incorporated hyperlinks. (Walker, page 16, lines 10-26). In order to view the additional information associated with the incorporated hyperlinks, a viewer needs to ***click*** the hyperlinks, which is different from ***moving*** the pointer over the structured datum. In the former case (clicking a hyperlink), a new browsing window opens and displays the associated data file or the current browsing window, instead of continue to display the current electronic file, displays the associated data file. (Walker, page 19 (labeled page number 18), lines 26-28, and page 51, lines 7-10 (After user click a hyperlink, browser displays the associated web page)). In contrast, the latter case (moving the pointer over the structured datum) which is claimed, causes “the additional information being simultaneously displayable as an overlay in an area proximate to the structured datum” in the current

browsing window *together* with the augmented data file, without having to open a new browsing window.

Further, when viewers move pointers over hyperlinks in the electronic files (e.g., web pages) processed using a system as disclosed in Walker, no additional information is transmitted and displayed to the viewer. As a result, these web pages in systems like Walker quickly can become out-dated. For example, the hyperlinks incorporated into the web pages by a system like Walker can become broken links and lead viewers to error pages or unintended web pages. Unlike Walker, in the claimed invention, as viewers move pointers over the structured datum of an augmented data file, additional information is transmitted from the reference database and simultaneously displayed to the viewers. As a result, the viewers are viewing the latest information in the reference database associated with the structured datum along with the augmented data file in the same browsing window. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 21 (and, in turn, also claims 1, 30, 41, 52, and 63) is patentably distinguishable over Walker.

As to the dependent claims, because claims 2-15, 19-20 are dependent on claim 1, claims 22-29 are dependent on claim 21, claims 31-38 are dependent on claim 30, claims 42-49 are dependent on claim 41, claim 53-60, 62 are dependent on claim 52, claims 64-77, 79-82 are dependent on claim 63, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 21 are hereby incorporated so as to apply to claims 1-15, 19-20, 22-38, 41-49, 52-60, 62-77, and 79-82.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) in View of Walker and Skillen

In the 5th paragraph of the Office Action, Examiner rejects claims 16-18, 39, 40, 50, 51, 61, and 78 under 35 USC § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Walker and

U.S. Patent No. 6,098,065 to Skillen et al. (“Skillen”). Claims 17, 18, 39, 50, and 61 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-18, 39, 40, 50, 51, 61, and 78 as amended are patentable over the cited references, and in condition for allowance.

As stated above, claims 1, 30, 41, 52, and 63 are patentably distinguishable over Walker because they recite the element of transmitting additional information to be displayed near the structured datum *when* the pointer *moves* over the structured datum, and Walker, among other differences, does not disclose the claimed transmitting element. Because claims 16-18 are dependent on claim 1, claims 39-40 are dependent on claim 30, claims 50-51 are dependent on claim 41, claim 61 is dependent on claim 52, and claim 78 is dependent on claim 63, they all recite the above cited feature.

Skillen, like Walker, does not disclose the claimed transmitting element. Skillen discloses a method of providing desired information to a user searching for desired information within a data network. The method comprising receiving search request from the user, searching in the data network, and providing the result back to the user. (Skillen, col. 1, lines 37-67, col. 2, lines 1-10). Skillen does not teach or suggest transmitting additional information to be displayed near the structured datum when the pointer moves over the structured datum.

The combination of Walker and Skillen likewise fails to disclose or suggest the claimed transmitting element. As discussed above, the claimed transmitting element is not disclosed in either reference. Even if the two references arguably could be combined, at best the combination provides a linking mechanism to get access to data at another location (the URL link) within an electronic file, which is conventional and not what Applicants claim.

Thus, alone or in combination, Walker and Skillen do not disclose the claimed transmitting element.

Based on the above Amendment and Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least these reasons, claims 16-18, 39-40, 50-51, 61, and 78 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references, both alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider the rejection, and withdraw it.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-82, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Douglas Stevenson and Craig Allen Gooding

Date: September 22, 2006

By: _____ /Rajiv P. Patel/

Rajiv P. Patel, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,327
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7607
Fax: (650) 938-5200